Mission of Republicans—Sectionalism of Modern Democracy.

SPEECH

OF

ROBERT McKNIGHT, OF PENN.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, April 24, 1860.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, and having under consideration the bill to provide for the payment of outstanding Treasury notes, to authorize a loan, to regulate and fix the duties on imports, and for other purposes—

Mr. McKNIGHT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It will hardly be denied that the country is most independent, and consequently most prosperous, which produces within her own borders all articles needful for the use of her citizens. Such, it has long been contended, should be the policy of this Government; that, by a wholesome and beneficent system of revenue laws, she should discriminate in favor of our own labor and skill, over that of foreign lands, and kindly foster our nascent industry until it has grown with the growth of the country to the full stature of manhood, when it may defiantly throw down the gauntlet, and challenge all competitors.

This doctrine seems early to have impressed our statesmen, and we find it pressed upon the consideration of Congress from the formation of the Government. First, by Washington, who says:

"Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

By Monroe, of Virginia, who says:

"Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing, as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries. While we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, unsought and unexpected, cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. Equally important is it to provide a home market for our raw materials. The preservation of our manufactures, then, which depends on due encouragement, is connected with the high interests of the nation. Satisfied I am, whatever may be the abstract doctrine in favor of unrestricted commerce, (provided all nations would concur in it, and it was not liable to be interrupted by war, which has never occurred, and cannot be expected,) that there are other strong reasons applicable to our situation and relations with other countries which impose on us the obligations to cherish and sustain our manufactures."

By Jackson, a Southern man, who says:

"While the chief object of duties should be revenue, they may be so adjusted as to encourage manufacture. Of these objects of protection, the productions of our soil, our mines, and our workshops, essential to national defence, occupy the first rank."

These being the tenets of the Democratic fathers, why has modern Democracy proved faithless to such teachings, and attempted to destroy the ancient landmarks in this, as in other doctrines, once dear to their saints? Is it because the principle of protection, when carried out, increases the price of the articles so protected to the consumer, and thus imposes a burden grievous to be borne?

Such has recently been the cry of Southern Democrats on this floor. But though at first blush specious and plausible, this objection is not tenable; and its fallacy has been often proved here and elsewhere, showing that this theory will not stand the test of truth and experience. On the contrary, it has been fully demonstrated that the inevitable result of protective duties on all articles which can be manufactured at home is to start new establishments for their production, greatly increasing the home competition, and necessarily diminishing the price. If a duty be laid, deemed by the capitalist adequate to justify him in investing his capital, the investment is at once made; provided, confidence is felt in the permanency of the duty, which, after all, is more important to him than a very high duty.

And thus, where ten establishments have been dragging out a sickly existence, one hundred start into life and vigor; while the old

ones, with new vitality, increase the number of their [illegible] working double sets night and day, [illegible] using their product. This [illegible] paradox, which the advocates [illegible] never can or never will [illegible] position of a duty is not [illegible]r. They persist in ignoring [illegible] when an investment is always [illegible] real estate, buildings, machinery, house rent, teams, and all the [illegible]ed adjuncts to a manufactory, with interest, taxes, and insurance, running thereon, all the expenses must come out of the product; and the greater that is, the more is the expense distributed, and the price of the article can be reduced, while the manufacturer reaps the benefit of a ready market near at hand.

The foreign producer, in order to compete with this new condition of things, is compelled to deliver his wares in our ports, if he hopes to command the market, at the old prices, before the increase of duty, and thus he is compelled to pay that duty. This is not mere theory, but is abundantly sustained by the facts under the tariff of 1842, which, in the words of Henry Clay, covered the country with blessings. If any one doubts the result, let him refer to the statistical tables, with the Secretary's report, which are too voluminous for insertion here, and he will find that the prices of coal, cottons, prints, sheetings, cloths, carpets, and iron of all kinds, manufactured in this country, ran down gradually from the year 1841 to 1846, when the Democratic tariff was passed; while other articles, not manufactured here, and therefore having little or no competition, such as china, silk goods, gloves, tin plates, &c., actually advanced in price in the same period. And although the then Secretary, R. J. Walker, just before the passage of that bill, assured the country, in his official report, that every ton of coal mined in the United States cost $1.60 more than it would under the free trade system, he must have overlooked the significant fact, that the full price of a ton of coal, in the chief marts of Pennsylvania, did not exceed that amount. The tax paid by the consumer of nails was put in the same report at $90 per ton, the full price then paid for nails, which now average some $60, and thus furnish a signal proof of the correctness of the position here taken. One would suppose these facts were damaging to such a theory. Not at all. Carry out your theory in spite of facts, is the rule. It is the Sangrado system over again, under which the patients are bleeding to death.

These facts seem to be well known to the French statesmen of this day, and especially to their Emperor, that shrewd, sagacious man, who controls alike the destiny and policy of France, if not of all Europe. He has recently concluded a commercial treaty with Mr. Cobden, the eminent free-trade champion, on behalf of Great Britain, which admits French articles free into that kingdom, but lays high duties on all British articles imported into France which compete with French manufactures. This treaty has not yet been ratified by the British Parliament, and is so unpalatable to Englishmen, that it probably never will be. To show that the view here taken is that taken in England, I quote from an able writer in the last Blackwood's Magazine, discussing the Anglo-Gallican treaty above cited:

"Generally speaking, the market price will be fixed by our own producers, and the only appreciable consequence of the abolition of duties will be the loss to the revenue. But, it may be asked, who will profit by the remission? We answer, in this case, the foreign producer. There are, correctly speaking, only three parties who can derive any benefit from a remission of duty—the producer, the retailer, and the consumer. In this case it is the producer, he the Dutchman or Dane, that must be the gainer. He will not lower the price of his cheese, butter, &c., because he knows they command certain prices in the British market. Like a wise man, he will pocket the difference, and snigger at the simplicity of the *pudden-headed* English, who are giving him a bonus which he certainly had no reason to expect."

I fear some of our politicians would subject themselves to the same contemptuous epithet.

The maxim is current among political economists, that the only road to free trade is through protection, as has been proved by the article of nails. But the objection is often made, that the tariff benefits only the manufacturer, and at the expense of the agriculturist. This is another fallacy. Nowhere is there a better market for all the products of the soil than in a manufacturing town, where the teeming, thrifty population, in the daily receipt of their hard-earned wages, must be supplied from the adjacent country. Go into the vicinity of these hives of industry, and ask the tillers of the soil (sneeringly called by the Southern Democracy close-fisted farmers) when they are most prosperous, and they will tell you, when the mills and workshops in the neighboring town are in full operation, and they find a ready and remunerative market near their own door; and save the cost and trouble of distant transportation, and the loss by deterioration of produce in such transit to a distant market. Therefore it is that every manufactory benefits the agriculturist, by creating a new demand and a reliable home market, the very best and surest for the products of his farm. And therefore it is that the great producing States are deeply interested in the growth and development of manufactures.

When, therefore, because of inadequate protection, the factories and mills must close, what becomes of the busy operatives who toiled and prospered there? Compelled to earn a livelihood for themselves and families, while our free-trade theorists are paying bounties to foreign workmen, they must move to the country, live on their small farms, and undertake to raise food sufficient to keep the wolf from their doors; from consumers becoming producers, and thus coming into direct competition with the farmer. These facts and results are so palpable to our people, that they are no longer

deceived by the illusions of free trade. They know that the supply increased by competition causes a fall in the prices of manufactured articles; and that the same increased competition creates increased demand for the products of the soil, which must advance in price; and thus the tariff unites this golden circle of blessings.

Such a simple proposition needs no further discussion; and I proceed to inquire, *what is the posture of modern Democracy on this vital question?* Though usually good at dodging these issues, especially in Pennsylvania, they will hardly deny that "our own Dallas" gave the casting vote in the Senate which repealed the beneficent tariff of 1842, and that the revenue laws since enforced, and appropriately termed British tariffs, were passed and are sustained by them; and although the Democratic President still continues, though with bated breath, to send his message to Congress, recommending specific duties, &c., he conveniently sends along with the bane of recommendation an antidote, in the report of his Secretary of the Treasury, who quietly flouts his chief, and scouts at his suggestions, as absurd and "exploded." Yet he is permitted to retain his place, and continue his official assaults on the industry of the country, while Democratic presses utter the stinging sarcasm, "why, the President is opposed to the Administration!" Shade of Jackson! Why does not the Executive fiat issue to the recusant Secretary—"Stand not upon the order of your going, but go at once!"

But, says my colleague from the navy yard district, [Mr. FLORENCE,] in his recent speech:

"The resolution of the recent Democratic Convention (at Reading, Pennsylvania) has, at any rate, an unmistakable meaning. It is, that the conviction of the Democratic party remains unshaken in the wisdom and policy of adequate protection of iron, coal, wool, and the other great staples of the country, based upon the necessities of a reasonable revenue system of the General Government; and approving the views of President Buchanan upon the subject of specific duties, we earnestly desire our Representatives in Congress to procure such modification of the existing laws as the unwise legislation of the Republican party in 1857 renders absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the great industrial interests of Pennsylvania."

My colleague was right in saying that this refreshingly cool resolution "has an unmistakable meaning." There is no mistake that it is another attempt, with face of brass, to hoodwink and deceive the confiding Democracy of Pennsylvania, after the Polk-Dallas and tariff-of-1842 fashion: first, by deliberately falsifying the record as to the tariff of 1857, which it is notorious that the Democratic Senate forced on Congress that year in its expiring moments; and next, by roundly asserting that the vaporing resolution of a Pennsylvania Convention on this subject is the conviction of the Democratic party, which has heretofore planted its heel on the neck of protection, and crushed out its vitality; ay, and will be found repeating the operation again on this very bill, so far as in them lies; though he and his two Democratic colleagues (for, in his lugubrious phrase, "we are but three, all told,") may find it convenient to vote with the friends of the tariff, especially as their votes are not needed, and cannot change the result. Provided, nevertheless, they do not, as one of them [Mr. MONTGOMERY] did on the passage of the act of 1857, get "*hungry*, and leave the Hall for the matter of fifteen minutes, to get something to eat," just as the vote was taken. What a remarkable fact, that man's appetite should seize and control him just at the most inopportune juncture! Would it not be better that a Democratic member of Congress should endure the pangs of hunger "for the matter of" a few hours, than that his constituents should suffer for months and years for want of adequate reward for their labor? What a pity it is that tariff Democrats should, like the Irishman's pigs, frisk about so much, that they cannot be counted on the final vote. But, says my colleague, further, of us Republicans:

"I believe it is their intention to force through this House a tariff bill, which they hope and know the Senate will not accept, and then they will cry that the Democratic Senate has defeated the tariff."

Mr. Chairman, this is a remarkable vaticination. We do intend to perfect and pass the present bill, in the hope of relieving the country, lifting its prostrate industry from the dust, and starting the plow, the loom, and the engine; and if the Democratic Senate shall see fit to arrest the passage of the bill, and dash the cup of hope and blessing from the lips of honest labor, rest assured we "will cry that they have defeated the tariff." Ah! and we will cry aloud, and spare not. But let me tell my colleague and his Democratic friends, there is one effectual way to stop that cry, and steal that thunder; and that is, by promptly passing this bill through the Senate, affixing the Presidential sanction, and putting it into operation, which may all be done within sixty days. I invite the Democracy to that entertainment, and shall be glad to make merry with them, because this great question, too long the foot-ball of contending parties, shall have been removed from the political arena. I await the issue.

To secure such a consummation, I should be glad to see Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and North Carolina, (I would like to include Georgia, on the strength of her former history, but, alas! I fear she is joined to the Gulf squadron,) present a solid front and cast a solid vote to secure protection to that manufacturing industry, which, applied to the vast resources of those great States, would so decidedly advance their growth and material prosperity.

What is needed by Virginia, with her vast mineral wealth, her genial climate, her rich soil, her noble rivers, her healthful mountain slopes, her flourishing manufacturing cities of Richmond and Wheeling, her borders laved

by the Ohio and the ocean, and her magnificent net-work of railways, providing her citizens with ready access to market, and, lastly, the clustering memories of her once proud position as first of American States; what needs she to enable her to recover and maintain that position, but free labor? It is well known, and gratifying, that her manufactures are developing and extending, and, if we may judge from the homespun garb in which some of her Representatives are clad this session, a new impetus is about to be given to her home manufactures. True, the suit of one of them [Governor SMITH] is a little coarse in texture, while it is slyly whispered, that if all the material therein made in New England, or in old England, and imported through Northern ports, were withdrawn, it would fall to the ground, and *strip* its wearer of his reliance on Virginia garments; yet "we must not despise the day of small things."

I much fear that this great industrial interest is destined to be absorbed by the negro question, which, like Aaron's rod, swallows all minor ones, and which, having completely sectionalized the Democracy, is rapidly converting that once powerful party into mere propagandists of slavery. Already they have succumbed to the yoke of their Southern rulers, and proved recreant to the faith of their Democratic fathers. Already they seem to have abandoned all thought of legislation to better the condition of the white man, and to have bent all their efforts and aims to foster and diffuse human bondage. And yet, these self-styled Democrats, who are everlastingly advancing the black flag under which they are enlisted, and whose only shibboleth is slavery, have the assurance to designate the friends of white labor as *Black* Republicans; and such is the polite prefix, used not only by the party organs, but on the floor of this Chamber, and even in the United States Senate, where dignity should reign. I beg to remind the Black Democracy of the old adage, about "the pot calling the kettle black," and to recommend its self-application.

Yet this party, which has scarce a foothold in any State north of Mason and Dixon, but whose whole strength is based on and derived from slavery and the intensest sectionalism, raise the cry against the Republicans, and call us sectional! Wherein do we differ from the Democratic fathers—from Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe? In no whit as regards human bondage being an evil, and therefore to be circumscribed, rather than (as now claimed by the new lights) a blessing to be diffused and perpetuated. For, say Senators MASON and DAVIS:

"It is true, our fathers looked upon slavery as an evil, and hoped to see it ended; but if they had lived now, with our light and experience, they would change their views, and look upon it as a blessing, which ennobles both the master and the slave."

Mistaken sires! how sad has been your lot, to have lived before your posterity, who "are wiser in their day and generation than the children of light!"

As part of the systematic machinery to secure the success of this sectional party, we are every four years treated to the same programme, as a prelude to the Presidential election: office-holding and slave propagandism must be perpetuated, or the Union dissolved. The same complaints and threats against the North, because of an imputed, but purely imaginary, desire to interfere with the peculiar institution, were started by Mr. Calhoun, seized on by his followers, and over and over reiterated. In 1849, these startling views were put forth in a high-sounding manifesto, to which were affixed the signatures of forty Southrons; among which, in addition to its author, Mr. Calhoun, are pre-eminent those of Mr. Thompson of the present Cabinet, and Senators HUNTER and MASON of Virginia, JEFFERSON DAVIS of Mississippi, FITZPATRICK of Alabama, SEBASTIAN and JOHNSON of Arkansas, YULEE of Florida, and IVERSON of Georgia, and the recent Democratic candidate for Speaker, Mr. BOCOCK. Here first appeared the deliberate announcement of that *irrepressible conflict*, on account of which such ear-splitting clamor has latterly been directed against the Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] who probably got his phrase, if not his idea, from this Southern bulletin, which enunciated it in stronger terms and more offensive shape than the famed Rochester speech. The latter speaks of ideas and principles—the Calhoun manifesto of conflict between sections, *e. g.*:

"We address you on the most important subject ever presented to your consideration. We allude to the conflict between the two great sections of the Union, growing out of a difference of opinion in reference to the two races—European and African, &c. The conflict commenced not long after the acknowledgment of our independence, and has gradually increased, until it has arrayed the great body of the North against the South on this most vital subject. In the progress of this conflict, aggression has followed aggression, and encroachment encroachment, until they have reached a point where a regard for peace and safety will not permit us to remain longer silent."

Now, what says Mr. Benton about these imaginary evils and trumped-up charges against the North?—and I cite his opinion here, because it fully answers and confutes the silly charges of modern Democracy:

"The manifesto contained a long list of grievances, as formidable in number as those which had impelled the separation from Great Britain, but so frivolous and imaginary in substance, that no one could now repeat them without recourse to the paper. But past or present encroachments were too light and apocryphal to rouse a nation; something more stirring was wanted; and for that purpose time and imagination, the future and invention, were to be placed in requisition. The abolition of slavery in the States; the emancipation of the slaves all over the South; the conflict between the white and black races; the whites the slaves of the blacks—such were the future terrors and horrors to be visited upon the slave States, if not arrested by an instant and adequate remedy."—*2 Benton's Thirty Years' View*, 784.

"Now, this certain emancipation of slaves in the States was a pure and simple invention of Mr. Calhoun, not only without evidence, but against evidence; contradicted by every species of human action, negative and positive, before and since. Far from attacking slavery in the States, the free States have co-operated to extend the area of slavery

in such States; witness the continued extinctions of Indian title, which have so largely increased the available capacity of the slave States. So far from making war upon slave States, several such States have been added to the Union, as Texas and Florida, by the co-operation of free States. Far from passing any law to emancipate slaves in the States, no Congress has ever existed that has seen a man who would make such a motion in the House, or if made, would not be as *unanimously rejected by one side of the House as the other*; as if the unanimity would not be the same, whether the whole North went out and let the South vote alone, or the whole South went out and let the North alone vote. Yet this incendiary cry of abolishing slavery in the States has become the staple of all subsequent agitators. Every little agitator now jumps upon it—jumps into a State the moment a free Territory is mentioned—and repeats all the alarming stuff invented by Mr. Calhoun, and as much more as his own invention can add. In the mean time, events daily affix the brand of falsehood on these incendiary inventions. Slave-State Presidents are continually elected by free-State votes; the price of slaves themselves, instead of sinking, as it would if there was any real danger, is continually augmenting; and, in fact, has reached a height, the double of what it was before the alarming story of emancipation had begun."—*2 Benton's View*, 735.

In addition to the opinions and counsels herein contained, something further was intimated; and that soon came in the shape of a Southern Convention to dissolve the Union, and a call from the Legislatures of South Carolina and Mississippi, for another Convention to put the machinery of the United States South into operation. This Convention met in Nashville. And soon after, Mississippi passed an act looking to representation in the Southern Congress, on the ground that the National Congress legislated against slavery and the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States, on which Mr. Benton thus comments:

"Waiving the question whether these reasons, if true, would be sufficient to justify this abrupt attempt to break up the Union, an issue of fact can well be taken on their truth. It was an assertion without evidence, contrary to the evidence, and contrary to fact. There was no such settled purpose to destroy slavery or subvert slavery in the States, in the majority of Congress, nor in a minority, nor in any half dozen members of Congress. It was calculated to mislead and inflame the ignorant, and make them fly to disunion as the refuge against such an appalling catastrophe.

"But it was not a new declaration. It was part and parcel of the original agitation of slavery, commenced in 1835, and continued ever since. To destroy slavery in the States has been the design attributed to the Northern States from that day to this, and is necessary to be kept up in order to keep alive the slavery agitation in the slave States. It has received its constant and authoritative contradiction in the conduct of those States at home, and in the acts of their Representatives in Congress, year in and year out; and continues to receive that contradiction continually; but without having the least effect upon its repetition and incessant reiteration. In the mean time, there is a fact visible in all the slave States, which shows that, notwithstanding these twenty years' repetition of the same assertion, there is no danger to slavery in any slave State. Property is timid, and slave property above all; and the market is the test of safety and danger to all property. Nobody gives full price for anything that is insecure, either in title or possession. All property, in danger from either cause, sinks in price when brought to that infallible test. Now, how is it with slave property, tried by this unerring standard? Has it been sinking in price since the year 1835—since the year of the first alarm manifesto in South Carolina, and the first of Mr. Calhoun's twenty years' alarm speeches in the Senate? On the contrary, the price has been continually rising the whole time, and is still rising, although it has attained a height incredible to have been predicted twenty years ago.

"But although the slavery alarm does not act on property, yet it acts on the feelings and passions of the people, and excites sectional animosity, hatred for the Union, and desire for separation. The Nashville Convention, and the call for the Southern Congress, were natural occasions to call out these feelings; and most copiously did they flow."

Now, is not this an exact counterpart to all the allegations and clamors, the threats and plots of the present day? Yet, after the style of the old fable, our Southern brethren having thus disturbed and muddied the pellucid stream of our nation's history, ten years agone, now come down to where we are calmly drinking, and threaten our throats while imbibing that perturbed water which flowed past them to us. And since the absurd and puerile farce of Helper's book is played out, they threaten they will never submit to the inauguration of a Republican President. Sir, if this threat had substance and being, and the right of the majority to rule were denied, then have we no longer a Republic—no longer a Union.

But to demonstrate still further that modern Democracy is entirely sectional, looking only South, and sacrificing the rights and interests of the white man and of free labor to the demands of the slave power, I ask attention to the following votes, in the present Congress, on great questions where the rights and happiness of freemen were closely involved. First on the homestead bill, which was to open up the great West to the freeman, who could settle on and cultivate a farm, which by reason thereof should be to him a home forever; the compensation to Government being, that the wilderness would be broken up by the plow-share, and caused "to bring forth seed to the sower and bread to the eater," and thus add to the material wealth and prosperity of the country.

On the final passage of this beneficent measure, on March 12, 1860, the vote was:

	Yeas.	Nays.
Republicans	86	none.
Democrats	22	49
South Americans	1	17
Anti-Lecompton Democrats	6	none.
	115	66

The Republican party voting unanimously for it, the Democrats more than two to one against it; one only of their twenty-two yeas being from a slave State, while, with that and one other exception, [Mr. ETHERIDGE, of Tennessee,] the whole South voted nay; because they knew it inured to the benefit of free labor rather than slave, which is contrary to their settled policy.

Again, on the same day, an effort was made to suspend the rules, in order to introduce the tariff bill, which required a two-thirds vote. That vote resulted as follows:

	Yeas.	Nays.
Republicans	85	1
Democrats	3	65
Anti-Lecompton Democrats	5	none.
South Americans	12	3
	105	69

Because this modern Democracy voted twen-

ty to one against introducing the tariff, it was thrown out; while the only vote among Republicans against it, was that of the worthy gentleman from New York, [General SPINNER,] an old free-trade Democrat, reared in the true Democratic faith, where they do not look one way and row the other; and who, being unable to overcome the prejudices of early training, (though sound and true in all other respects,) stands here the one exception, which always strengthens the general rule.

Next comes the vote, on the 5th instant, on the bill to suppress polygamy in the Territories. And here one would have supposed that even the Democracy of the present day would have been glad of the opportunity to leave slavery out of view, and unite with the Republicans, as patriots, statesmen, and Christians, in a well-directed effort to suppress bestiality, eradicate an alarming malignant disease from the body politic, stamp with condemnation a heinous crime, and wipe out this foul blot from our national escutcheon. Mark how the hopes and prayers of all Christendom were redeemed. On the passage of the bill, the vote stood:

	Yeas.	Nays.
Republicans	103	none.
Democrats	22	56
South Americans	18	3
Anti-Lecompton Democrats	6	1
	149	60

How could modern Democracy, under the control of the slavery propaganda, vote to condemn polygamy, which the Republican platform had denounced side by side with slavery as the "twin relics of barbarism!" And if, as some of them said in debate, you condemned and ostracised one twin, what was to become of the other, which must possess the necessary attribute of twinhood, namely, resemblance? Well might Parson Brownlow say "he was curious to see the names of those sixty gentlemen of easy virtue who voted no."

Lastly regard the vote on the admission of Kansas into the Union, taken on the 11th instant:

	Yeas.	Nays.
Republicans	103	none.
Democrats	22	56
South Americans	3	17
Anti-Lecompton Democrats	6	none.
	134	73

Here was outraged and bleeding Kansas, so long the sport and foot-ball of politicians, which had been knocking at the door of the Union for four years, and had been persistently and contemptuously refused admission into the family circle of sister States, but thrust away as an outcast, and taunted as a drab. And now, when she again presents herself, in the comely garb of freedom, decked with the ornaments of purity of the ballot and popular sovereignty—that charmed phrase—with her Wyandotte Constitution, against the legality of which no objection is urged, modern Democracy voted more than two to one to again exclude her, and again heap wrong and insult upon her. This, too, just before a Presidential election, although they had grown hoarse in charging that the Republicans did not want to admit Kansas, but wished to keep her bleeding for partisan purposes. We have done our part towards removing this vexed question from politics; and now, if the Democratic majority in the United States Senate shall strike hands with us in the passage of this measure, another root of bitterness will be at once removed.

This being the posture of that once powerful, national, but now sectional Democracy, with regard to these great questions, so vital to our well-being as a nation, let us ask what are the principles and measures full high advanced on their banners, in dark and ominous characters, in addition to free trade and polygamy in the Territories? They claim that Congress has no power to forbid an evil or crime in the Territories, though they are the lands of the United States, and Congress is the only law-making power thereof. As well deny to the farmer the right to lay down regulations for his farm, and to forbid thereon ill-behaved hands, or a particular breed of cattle. This doctrine of "no power" in Congress to prohibit slavery was scouted by the early fathers and statesmen of all parties; and it is now well known that President Monroe took the opinion on this question of all his Cabinet, in 1820; and that Cabinet, of which Mr. Calhoun was a member, *unanimously decided that Congress* had the power to exclude slavery. Not until 1838 did that gentleman change front, have a new vision, and lay down the new dogma of no power, which was at once caught up by his followers; and now, like the small-pox, infects the whole body of Democracy. On this a new heresy is now being engrafted, namely, that the Constitution, of its own strength, (*ex proprio vigore,*) *protects* slavery in all the Territories of the United States; of which startling doctrine, Mr. Bentou—than whom there was no abler, sounder, nor purer Democrat, nor one more learned in the Constitution, history, theory, and practice of the Government—thus speaks:

"A new dogma was invented to fit the case, that of the transmigration of the Constitution—the slavery part of it—into the Territories, overriding and overruling all the anti-slavery laws which it found there, and planting the institution there under its own wing, and maintaining it beyond the power of eradication, either by Congress or the people of the Territory. Before this dogma was proclaimed, efforts were made to get the Constitution extended to these Territories by act of Congress. Failing in those attempts, the difficulty was leaped over by boldly assuming that the Constitution went of itself—that is to say, the slavery part of it. In this exigency, Mr. Calhoun came out with his new and supreme dogma of the transmigratory function of the Constitution in the *ipso facto*, and the instantaneous transportation of itself, in its slavery attributes, into all acquired territories.

"History cannot class higher than as a vagary of a diseased imagination, this imputed self-acting and self-extension of the Constitution. The Constitution does nothing of itself, not even in the States for which it was made. Every part of it requires a law to put it into operation. No part of it can reach a Territory, unless imparted to it by act of Congress. Slavery, as a local institution, can only be established by a local legislative authority. It cannot transmigrate—cannot carry along with it the law which protects it; and if it could, what law would it carry? The code of the State from which the emigrant went? Then there would be as many slavery codes in the Territory as States furnishing emigrants, and these codes all varying more or less; and some of them in the essential nature of the property—the slave, in many States, being only a chattel interest, governed by the laws applicable to chattels; in others, as in Louisiana and Kentucky, a real-estate interest, governed by the laws which apply to landed property. In a word, this dogma of the self-extension of the slavery part of the Constitution to a Territory, is impracticable and preposterous, and as novel as unfounded."—2 *Benton's View*, pp. 713, 714.

Yet this miserable dogma is, and *must* be, the doctrine of the new Democratic church; and will either constitute a plank in the Charleston platform—possibly at this moment being fitted in—or, if not, it will be because the managers do not wish to alarm the Northern wing before the Presidential contest is decided, in which case they will "palter to us in a double sense," as in the Cincinnati platform. Turn your eyes for a moment to that gathering of the clans at Charleston, and see the scrambling and bids for the nomination, among Democratic aspirants who will not object to have greatness thrust upon them, and to square their opinions accordingly. How the Democratic Warwicks will set up one and pull down another, making and marring, until the supple one shall be found to be moulded at will, like clay in the hands of the potter, and finally merged into the platform. The scene may well remind us of the description of an old raree show, where the conjurer blows his horn, and shouts in loudest voice: "Walk up, walk up, gentlemen, and see the greatest wonder that the world ever wondered at—the three brothers, Hali, Muley, and Hassan. Hali will take a lighted candle, and jump down his brother Muley's throat; Muley will, in his turn, take another lighted candle, and jump down his brother Hassan's throat; while Hassan, though encumbered by the weight of his two brothers, Hali and Muley, will take a third lighted candle, turn a flip-flap, and jump down his own throat, leaving the spectators completely in the dark." And such, I fear, will be the fate of the Democratic spectators of the Charleston Convention. They will be in the dark until they get the cue, and their candidate and platform will be alike—the very thing; and light will begin to dawn.

Another doctrine dear to many of that party, though few are bold enough to avow it openly, like the gentleman from Mississippi, [Governor McRae,] is that of reopening the African slave trade, with all its crimes, cruelties, and horrors. True, many of those interrogated here have said they are not in favor of opening it *now*; but I have failed to hear them clearly define that little word "now," in this connection. Does it mean until after next election, and the propagandists shall, as they hope, have a new lease of power? I so believe, and here predict, that such will be found to be its meaning. And why not? If the new evangel be true, that slavery is a blessing to both master and slave, and that this is the best way to Christianize Africa, by bringing her benighted children to our missionaries, instead of sending the missionaries to them, then the legitimate and righteous inference must be, that the slave trade should be reopened. For my single self, I may be permitted to say that I cannot understand how this new system can well work until I first see some plan for restoring the imported and Christianized Africans to those shores,

> "Where Afric's sunny fountains
> Roll down their golden sands"—

which, in view of the present hostility, South, to the Colonization Society, can hardly be hoped.

With the system of slavery in the slave States, we have neither the right nor desire to interfere. You of the South have the right to manage that among yourselves in your own way, without interference from abroad. If there existed a calmer and better state of feeling between the sections of this Union, which ought to be harmonious and fraternal, instead of realizing the description,

> "Lands, intersected by a narrow frith,
> Abhor each other; and mountains
> Make enemies of nations,"

we would cheerfully counsel with you as to ameliorating the condition of those having immortal souls, and advancing them in the scale of being; but in the present state of mistrust we refrain, and merely tender our interest and sympathy in all well-directed efforts in that direction, while we condemn and deprecate every movement which looks to a violent and bloody solution of the great problem. Yet, with these convictions and views, we sat here for two months, subjected to studied misrepresentation and abuse; Southern members, with hollow professions of attachment to the Union, making bitter speeches, reproachful and calumnious toward the majority of their countrymen, calculated to stir up the worst feelings, and create estrangement leading to that dissolution which others more treasonably avowed, and all on the miserable pretext that some gentlemen in this nominally free country had seen fit to recommend a book. Surely the familiar lines should henceforth read: Oh that mine enemy had *recommended* a book. This, however, has become part of the usual Presidential programme; and frequent repetition has detracted from its novelty and interest.

But while we say, "hands off!" as regards the local regulation of your own institutions, we should feel recreant to humanity, to civilization, to the enlightened spirit of the age, if we did not condemn and contest these new dogmas of the Calhoun or modern Democracy; if we did not seek to retain and secure to freedom and free labor that vast expanse of territory which now attracts the husbandman and

the vine-dresser. The mission of the Republican party is to secure for this immense area the multiplied blessings of freedom, always anticipated and desired by the early fathers of the Republic, and advocated in glowing terms, in these latter days, by Webster, Benton, and Clay; the last of whom said, but ten years ago:

"Coming, as I do, from a slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and well matured determination, that no power—no earthly power—shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of that line (that is, Missouri line, 36° 30′) into new territory.

"Sir, while you reproach, and justly, too, our British ancestors for the introduction of this institution upon the continent of America, I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants of California and New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just what we reproached Great Britain for doing to us."

These are words fitly spoken, and should have weight with all. I trust that Republicans will not long be subject to the reproach conveyed in the remark made by a celebrated Englishman, Mr. Cobden, who recently visited our shores, and listened to the debates in our Halls of Congress, to this effect:

"That the Republicans advocated the most noble and admirable sentiments timidly, while modern Democracy put forward the most shameful and revolting dogmas with perverted intellect and front of brass."

If free thought and free speech shall be suppressed in the national Capitol, and the mighty West, instead of being the abode of freemen, and echoing the blows and songs of free labor, shall be covered with the dark pall of human bondage, then indeed will the sun of our civilization have gone back on the dial. Then, in the words of the gifted Wirt:

"Our sun shall have gone down in infamy and crime in the face of the world, and instead of being proud of our country, as heretofore, we may well call on the rocks and mountains to fall upon us, and hide our shame from the face of earth and heaven."

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.

HON. PRESTON KING, N. Y., *Chairman.*
" J. W. GRIMES, IOWA.
" L. F. S. FOSTER, CONN.
On the part of the Senate.
" E. B. WASHBURNE, ILLINOIS.

HON. JOHN COVODE, PENN., *Treasurer.*
" E. G. SPAULDING, N. Y.
" J. B. ALLEY, MASS.
" DAVID KILGORE, INDIANA.
" J. L. N. STRATTON, N. J.
On the part of the House of Reps.

During the Presidential Campaign, Speeches and Documents will be supplied at the following reduced prices:

Eight pages, per hundred	$0.50
Sixteen " "	1.00
Twenty-four "	1.50

Address either of the above Committee.

GEORGE HARRINGTON, *Secretary.*